

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

APR 12 2004

To:
JAMES D. DECAMP
CLARK & ELBING LLP
101 FEDERAL STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

ACTION DUE Reply
DUE DATE 6-9-04
INITIALS ma

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of Mailing
(day/month/year)

09 APR 2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference

REPLY DUE

within 2 months/days from
the above date of mailing

07678/116WO2

International application No.

International filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (day/month/year)

PCT/US03/22585

18 July 2003 (18.07.2003)

18 July 2002 (18.07.2002)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): A 24 B 15/28 and US Cl.: 131/296, 290, 309, 310, 300, 299

Applicant

PHASEX CORPORATION

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

I ☒ Basis of the opinion

II ☐ Priority

III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention

V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

VI ☐ Certain documents cited

VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application

VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 18 November 2004 (18.11.2004)

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230

Authorized officer
Donnie A. Walls

Telephone No. (571) 272-1700

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US03/22585

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-11 _____, as originally filed
 pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims:
 pages 12-16 _____, as originally filed
 pages NONE _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings:
 pages 1-2 _____, as originally filed
 pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages NONE _____, as originally filed
 pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
 pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages NONE _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. NONE _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/22585

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>11-27, 29-32</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-10, 28, 33-37</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-37</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-37</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-10, 28, and 33-37 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Niven, Jr. et al (US. Pat. No. 4,727,889). Niven, Jr. et al discloses all that is recited in the claims (see entire document).

Claims 11-27, 29-32 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Niven, Jr. et al (US. Pat. No. 4,727,889).

These claims differ due to recitation regarding separating constituents from the critical fluid; however this would have been an obvious step in order to remove the constituent so that the subcritical fluid can be further processed and/or recycled.

Claims 1-37 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.